	M5Q3SHE1	
1 2	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORKx	
3	UNITED STATES OF AMERICA, New York, N.Y.	
4	v. 20 Cr. 412 (AT)	
5	TIMOTHY SHEA,	
6	Defendant. Trial	
7	x	
8	May 26, 2022 9:00 a.m.	
9	9.00 a.m.	
10	Before:	
11	HON. ANALISA TORRES,	
12	District Judge and a Jury	
13	ana a cary	
14	APPEARANCES	
15	DAMIAN WILLIAMS	
16	United States Attorney for the Southern District of New York	
17	BY: ALISON G. MOE NICOLAS T. ROOS	
18	ROBERT B. SOBELMAN Assistant United States Attorneys	
19	MERINGOLO & ASSOCIATES P.C.	
20	Attorneys for Defendant BY: JOHN C. MERINGOLO	
21	ANGELICA B. CAPPELLINO CLARA S. KALHOUS	
22		
23	Also Present: Sunny Drescher, Paralegal Specialist, USAO	
24		
25		

```
(Trial resumed; jury not present)
1
 2
               THE COURT: Good morning.
 3
               MR. ROOS: Good morning, your Honor.
 4
               THE COURT: Please make your appearances.
 5
6
               MR. ROOS: Good morning, your Honor. Nick Roos,
 7
      Alison Moe, and Robert Sobelman for the government. We're
      joined at counsel table by Sunny Drescher, a paralegal in our
8
9
      office.
10
               MR. MERINGOLO: John Meringolo, Angelica Cappellino,
11
      and Clara Kalhous for Mr. Shea who is standing to my right.
12
               THE COURT: I understand you're ready now?
13
               MR. ROOS: I think that's mostly right. We're set I
14
      think on all the stipulations except there's five -- correct me
15
      if I'm wrong -- five defense e-mails that we'll stip to the
      authenticity, but we think are hearsay, inadmissible hearsay,
16
17
      irrelevant, or more confusing than they are probative. So we
18
      object to those. We've otherwise stipulated to everything else
      I think at issue.
19
20
               So I think Mr. Meringolo wanted to tee it up for your
21
      Honor, get a ruling on the admissibility of those, and we'll
22
      include them in the stipulation or not.
23
               THE COURT: Those in the gallery may be seated.
24
               MR. MERINGOLO: Your Honor --
25
               THE COURT: Anyone who isn't speaking may be seated.
```

MOQSSRE

MR. MERINGOLO: Your Honor, we agreed to these yesterday. I went to bed, I didn't see the e-mail chain last night. We came in this morning, there are five -- six e-mails. I'm going over them with my team. I guess we can make arguments on admissibility. I believe the government is right on some of them, and they are.

But Judge, we have these decisions done last night that we agreed in good faith to stipulate to them, and then we, I come in -- Clara was doing it last night, and I come in the morning and now we're not stipulating to them.

There is nothing you can do. This is just me talking. I understand. But sometimes you say something, you do it in life. Like I said, if I opened the door, I opened the door.

So, I can go through, I can give these to you, your Honor, to make a ruling. If they're admissible or not. And I guess it is not that much, Judge. And I don't mean to put you through this, to make you work something that I think is unnecessary.

THE COURT: That's what I get paid for.

MR. MERINGOLO: I understand, Judge. But we can do the government's case, maybe release the jury, do the 29, make a ruling here, and then I can go through it, 15, 20 minutes tops.

THE COURT: Okay. I'd like just to get information concerning which particular e-mails are at issue so that I can

have my staff look at them while we are hearing from the prosecution.

MR. ROOS: I believe it's Defense Exhibits --

MR. MERINGOLO: I have give the exhibit numbers, your Honor. It's 615, 707, those are my lucky numbers, 705, 717, and 713, sorry, 753.

THE COURT: After 717 what was it?

MR. MERINGOLO: I went back to 713, I'm sorry. 717,

THE COURT: So the prosecution argues that these are all hearsay?

MR. ROOS: Your Honor, yes. The first answer is yes to your Honor's question. 717, I don't see in the defense stip --

MR. MERINGOLO: Clara pulled it out, I'm sorry.

MR. ROOS: Just to clarify for the record, the defense stipulation lists maybe, I don't know, 15 documents. Our objections are to 615, 705, 707, 713, and 753.

Our view, in our view they are inadmissible hearsay. The defense told us they are being offered to show they were doing work at the time, which seems to us to being offered for their truth. Like, here is evidence we are doing work is in fact a statement for its truth.

And our view also there is no contest that people were doing work towards We Build the Wall. So these e-mails, which

your Honor will see are very difficult to follow and confusing, have a pretty minimal probative value in the case, and will be confusing and lack context for the jury.

Those are our objections to those five documents.

THE COURT: Mr. Meringolo, do you want to use these e-mails to show that the defendant was actually doing work?

MR. MERINGOLO: Partly I believe.

THE COURT: What else?

MR. MERINGOLO: Partly to impeach the government's theory that it was just a shell company. What else? That's it, Judge.

MR. ROOS: On the second point --

MR. MERINGOLO: If there is admissible evidence, if you rule that we could, we'll redact whatever you want to.

THE COURT: The bottom line is you are introducing it for the truth of the matter asserted.

MR. MERINGOLO: Let me just see.

MR. ROOS: I'll just add on the second point about
Ranch Property Management being a shell company, I don't think
there was anything about Ranch Property in there. Period. If
there is, maybe we can just focus the e-mail on that. I think
it is still offered for its truth either way.

MR. MERINGOLO: We're not offering for its truth. We're just offering that in fact that work was actually done.

THE COURT: You're offering it to prove the fact that

work was done. Okay. So that's offering it for its truth.

MR. MERINGOLO: Okay. Judge, if you can make a ruling, we had an agreement and I come from a different world. You know. Just a totally different world.

THE COURT: When I have a moment to review them, I will do that, and make my ruling.

MR. ROOS: And maybe it's on me because there was a lot going on and I wasn't in those conversations. I will note the defense stipulation they want us to sign reserves the government's objections under 401 and 403, so I am not sure what this --

MR. MERINGOLO: We -- we had an agreement yesterday.

I don't care what it says. That's what we had an agreement

and, Judge, this is court. This isn't my neighborhood. This

is the court. I understand. I just thought we had an

agreement, you can put them all in, let's move on. And that's

what we did. It's okay, Judge. It's okay.

THE COURT: Anything else?

MR. ROOS: No, your Honor. We're happy to proceed.

THE COURT: So, I'll have the jury come in, you are going to present certain stipulations; is that correct?

MR. ROOS: That's right, there's just two or three exhibits that from our view the transcript is not clear were actually -- we think are in, but I want to clear up the transcript cites. And then I think I have four or five

24

25

present and properly seated?

stipulations just to read in and offer the exhibits associated 1 with them and then we'll rest. 2 3 THE COURT: Okay. Then I will have the jurors go out, 4 and Mr. Meringolo, you'll make your motion. And I will make my 5 ruling on the e-mails. Then I'll have the jurors come back in, and I will excuse them for the weekend. 6 7 MR. MERINGOLO: We're going to put our case, right? THE COURT: You are going to be adding -- you are 8 9 going to be presenting something? 10 MR. MERINGOLO: I'm going to show them the e-mails and 11 read them the e-mails that's in evidence. 12 THE COURT: You are saying those e-mails that have 13 already been --14 MR. MERINGOLO: We'd still have 10 e-mails and we have a video which is two minutes, and one picture. I mean, Judge, 15 if you gave us 20 minutes, I'll have it all done. 16 17 THE COURT: You will get the amount of time that you 18 need. 19 MR. MERINGOLO: Okay. 20 THE COURT: Very well. Let's have the jurors come 21 back in. 22 (Jury present) 23 THE COURT: Do the parties agree that all jurors are

MR. MERINGOLO: Yes, your Honor.

M5Q3SHE1 1 MR. ROOS: Yes, your Honor. THE COURT: Please be seated. 2 3 Good morning, jurors. I apologize again for the 4 delay. 5 The prosecution may continue. 6 MR. ROOS: Thank you, your Honor. 7 First, your Honor, as a matter of housekeeping I believe stipulations S1, S3, S5 and S6 were previously admitted 8 9 and exhibits were admitted from it. I just want that to be 10 reflected in the transcript so I will note that now. 11 THE COURT: They are admitted. (Government's Exhibit S1, S3, S5, S6 received in 12 13 evidence) 14 MR. ROOS: Similarly Government Exhibit 452 was 15 admitted yesterday. 16 THE COURT: It's admitted. 17 (Government's Exhibit 452 received in evidence) 18 MR. ROOS: The government will now read a series of 19 stipulations if that's okay. 20 THE COURT: That's fine. 21 MR. ROOS: Ms. Drescher, can we please see Government 22 Exhibit S2. And I'll read it.

It is hereby stipulated and agreed by the United States of America and Timothy Shea, the defendant, that Government Exhibit 271 contains an accurate list of certain

23

24

25

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

checks to We Build the Wall that were received at 4833 Front Street, Unit B-158, Castle Rock, Colorado, and then provided to American Caging Inc. a donation processing service for processing and depositing into We Build the Wall's bank account.

Then there is some information about how to read the exhibit.

The government offers this stipulation and the cited Exhibit 271.

MR. MERINGOLO: No objection.

THE COURT: They are admitted.

(Government's Exhibit S2, 271 received in evidence)

MR. ROOS: And Ms. Drescher, can we please now publish for the jury Government Exhibit 271 which is the list of checks that were deposited.

Your Honor, this, like the exhibit yesterday, contains some personal information of donors so we ask that this spreadsheet, Government Exhibit 271, be maintained under seal.

THE COURT: Yes. It shall be under seal.

MR. ROOS: Ms. Drescher, if you can scroll down through the exhibit so everyone can see the number of names. Thank you. We can take that down.

Ms. Drescher, can we please now have Exhibit S9, which is another stipulation. And your Honor, government offers S9.

THE COURT: It is admitted.

```
(Government's Exhibit S9 received in evidence)
1
 2
               MR. ROOS:
                          Thank you, your Honor. Can we publish this
 3
      to the jury.
 4
               THE COURT: You may.
 5
               MR. ROOS: And I'll read it.
 6
               It is hereby stipulated and agreed by the parties that
 7
      on May 20, 2021, one payment of $292 was made toward the
      interest accrued on the $59,800 loan obtained from the Small
8
9
      Business Association on May 20, 2020, by Timothy Shea, the
10
      defendant, in connection with Ranch Property Marketing and
11
     Management LLC. No other payments have been made.
12
               Second no moneys on the loan are yet due at this time.
13
               Can we now see --
14
               THE COURT: One moment. Counsel, if counsel would
15
      step up, please.
16
               (At the sidebar)
17
               THE COURT: There is a typo. It says Small Business
18
     Association it should be "administration." Does everybody
      agree that it is administration?
19
20
               MR. MERINGOLO: Yes.
21
               MR. ROOS: Yes.
22
               THE COURT: You can correct it.
23
               (In open court)
24
               MR. ROOS: Your Honor, on S9, I'll just note it says
25
      Small Business Association I think that's a typo. It should
```

1 | say Small Business Administration. I think everyone agrees.

THE COURT: Everyone agrees it is a typo. It should be "administration."

MR. ROOS: Ms. Drescher, can we now see Government Exhibit S10. Which is a testimonial stipulation regarding Kris Kobach.

Government offers Exhibit S10. Can we publish it for the jury.

THE COURT: Go ahead. It is admitted.

(Government's Exhibit S10 received in evidence)

MR. ROOS: I'll read it.

If called to testify, Kris Kobach would testify as follows.

- 1. Kris Kobach is a licensed attorney in good standing with the bar of the state of Kansas. In late January 2019, he became general counsel of We Build the Wall and a member of its board of directors.
- 2. Defense Exhibit 508 is a video of Kris Kobach in 2019.
- 3. Kris Kobach recalls that at some point he was told that Timothy Shea was involved in hiring a security company to provide security services at a construction site for We Build the Wall.
- 4. Kris Kobach was not informed of, and had no knowledge of, payments from We Build the Wall to Brian Kolfage

in 2019 for compensation or salary. Kobach was not informed of, and had no knowledge of, payments from We Build the Wall to Ranch Property Marketing and Management or to Winning Energy LLC five. We Build the Wall never created an audit committee.

Thank you, Ms. Drescher. We can take that down.

Offer another stipulation and this one I think I'll need to use the Elmo. This is just for the parties, stipulation S12.

And the government offers stipulation S12.

THE COURT: It is admitted.

(Government's Exhibit S12 received in evidence)

MR. ROOS: May we publish it to the jury?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. ROOS: This stipulation says the parties agree that:

1. Rich Kaye is a partner at the law firm of Barnes & Thornburg LLP in Atlanta, Georgia. He is a licensed attorney in good standing with the state bar. Mr. Kaye's law firm e-mail address is RichKaye@BTlaw.com.

Second. In 2018 and 2019, Rich Kaye provided legal services to We Build the Wall.

3. Government Exhibit 129 is an e-mail sent on October 22, 2019, by Rich Kaye from his personal e-mail address which is RichKayeesq@gmail.com to Amanda Shea at ATSheamedia@gmail.com.

Ms. Drescher, can we publish Government Exhibit 129 which is in evidence.

And Ms. Drescher, can we look at the attachment which is Government Exhibit 129A.

Thank you, you can take this down. And if we can use the Elmo again just for the parties.

Government offers Exhibit S11.

THE COURT: It is admitted.

(Government's Exhibit S11 received in evidence)

MR. ROOS: May we publish?

THE COURT: You may.

MR. ROOS: It is hereby stipulated and agreed by the parties that on August 20, 2020, Timothy Shea, the defendant, was arrested by federal law enforcement agents pursuant to a court-issued warrant after a grand jury sitting in the Southern District of New York filed the indictment that initiated this criminal case.

We'll take this down. One moment, please.

And with that, your Honor, the government rests.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, the government has rested and has finished presenting evidence. That does not mean that the trial is over. We're going to take a brief recess, and I will be calling you back into the courtroom. Even though the government has rested, you cannot start deliberating. You cannot start deliberating until I tell you

that it's time to deliberate. So, don't discuss the case amongst yourselves, don't let anybody discuss the case in your presence. I will call you back in shortly.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: Mr. Meringolo?

MR. MERINGOLO: Yes, Judge. I'd like to make a Rule 29 motion.

Judge, respectfully submitted, the government hasn't proved Counts One through Three beyond a reasonable doubt.

We're requesting the Court to dismiss it because they haven't proved each and every element of each and every crime. And we ask the Court to dismiss the case.

In addition to that, if we could have 14 days for any briefing on a Rule 29. We would ask the Court, if we choose to do it in writing.

THE COURT: I'll hear from the government.

MR. ROOS: Your Honor, would you like to hear an oral argument or a response?

THE COURT: Yes.

MR. ROOS: Yes, your Honor.

Count One of the indictment alleges that the defendant conspired in a scheme to commit wire fraud by two ways. One, defrauding donors of money or property through false statements, representations or promises, and two, by defrauding We Build the Wall, Brian

Kolfage and others honest services by way of kickbacks. The evidence established at trial establishes that the defendant and his co-conspirators made false statements to the public by stating, among other things, on multiple occasions, that one, 100 percent of the money would go to constructing a border wall, and two, that the defendant as well as other individuals associated with We Build the Wall would not take a penny in compensation or salary.

Witnesses at this trial as well as e-mail evidence establish these were important or weighty considerations for people donating to We Build the Wall. And had they known that was not the case, it would have been material to their decision-making.

The evidence presented in the form of e-mails, text messages, and financial documents establish that Brian Kolfage in fact was paid through a series of approximately 12 different transactions whereby money was sent to an intermediary account and then kicked back to Brian Kolfage. And so that's Count One on both objects.

Clearly the evidence establishes by way of text messages and e-mails that there was a conspiracy amongst multiple people to carry this out.

Count Two is the money laundering charge. There is more than sufficient evidence to give this to the jury. First, the evidence by way of Special Agent Yves Hunziker establishes

through a series of charts that money was sent through intermediary accounts. We heard the testimony of an expert witness about the ways in which money laundering occurs, many of the different ways he describes money laundering happens is exactly what we see in these financial transactions here. Ways to conceal, and also on the second object, over \$10,000 or more in transactions involving crime proceeds. So that's Count Two.

And then on Count Three, which is obstruction by way of falsification of records, the evidence established that the defendant, after learning of a grand jury investigation in October 10, 2019 -- one second.

The defendant, after learning of the grand jury investigation in October of 2019, together with Brian Kolfage, created a document that was backdated to March 2019. The metadata presented yesterday establishes that document was created after they learned of the grand jury investigation.

Throughout each of these different counts, there is evidence that the defendant participated in the conspiracy. He, among other things, participated in the organization and creation of We Build the Wall, he participated in the money movements, he is on the text messages discussing transfers of payments.

So there is more than sufficient evidence to send this to a jury.

THE COURT: All right. I'll permit the defense to

submit a written motion. You have until June 9, so I will reserve decision. If no motion is submitted, I will issue a written decision on the docket.

Anything further?

MR. MERINGOLO: Nothing further from the defense, Judge.

THE COURT: All righty. So I am going to review the e-mails now and then I will come back with my decision. So we'll take a recess.

(Recess)

(In open court; jury not present)

THE COURT: I have reviewed the e-mails, and I agree with the defense that they do suggest that Mr. Shea undertook work to Build the Wall. However, they amount to hearsay, and so I'm not going to allow them to be admitted.

MR. MERINGOLO: Judge, just one thing. I'd like to preserve my right under Rule 29 for venue. I didn't, that the government didn't establish venue. So I'd like to preserve my right to do that in the memo if we choose to.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ROOS: I'm happy to speak to that or if they file a Rule 29 we can just respond there.

THE COURT: Why don't you speak to it.

MR. ROOS: Certainly, your Honor. So, there was ample evidence of venue. Among other things, there is records that

```
donors donated from the Southern District of New York. They used checks, they used GoFundMe in the Southern District of New York. The co-conspirators of the defendant filed their registration with New York to fundraise here. There is some other evidence that will come out during the closing, but I think that's more than enough to get us to the jury.
```

THE COURT: All right then. So I'll bring the jurors back in. And Mr. Meringolo, you will present your evidence.

(Jury present)

THE COURT: The parties agree that all jurors are present and properly seated?

MR. ROOS: Yes, your Honor.

MR. MERINGOLO: Yes, Judge.

THE COURT: Please be seated.

Members of the jury, we will now hear evidence presented by the defense.

Mr. Meringolo.

MR. MERINGOLO: Yes, your Honor. Your Honor, I'd like to read a stipulation.

THE COURT: Go ahead.

MR. MERINGOLO: It is hereby agreed and stipulated by and between the United States of America and Timothy Shea, the defendant, that Defense Exhibit 602, 613, 629, 627, 628, 728, 740, 763, 764 and 800, and their subparts, are authentic copies of e-mails and their attachments produced by e-mail service

```
providers pursuant to a court-authorized search warrant. The "from", the "to," the "cc," the "bcc" fields accurately display the e-mail addresses that sent or received the e-mails. The "sent" field accurately displays the dates and the times on which the e-mails were sent. Subpart exhibits were attachments to the main e-mails, e-mail exhibits. For example, Defense Exhibit 602 was attached to Defense Exhibit -- 602A was attached to Defense Exhibit 602.
```

It is further stipulated and agreed that this stipulation as well as the defense exhibits received subject to any objections under rule 401 or 403 of the Federal Rules of Evidence. Dated May 26, 2022, signed by the government and myself.

THE COURT: It is admitted.

MR. MERINGOLO: Thank you judge.

(Defendant's Exhibit 602, 613, 627, 628, 728, 740, 763, 764, 800 & their subparts received in evidence)

MR. MERINGOLO: Judge, I would like to publish 728.

MR. SOBELMAN: I think defense counsel may have misspoke at one point and offered Exhibit Number 629 which we don't see on the stipulation.

MR. MERINGOLO: 629 I said, Judge?

THE COURT: I don't recall if you did.

MR. MERINGOLO: The letters and numbers jump for me so I'm sorry. It's not 629. It is 628.

2 MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, that's what is on the stipulation.

MR. MERINGOLO: I'm going to try to match this up.

I'd like to put it on the Elmo if we can.

Is that correct?

I'm going to put Exhibit Number 728 published to the jury.

It is an e-mail from Timothy Shea,

TimShea.realestate@gmail.com. Unarmed security contract. On

March 13, 2019. This is a contract for six unarmed bouncers

for Cobo. Sign it and send it back to me.

This is 740. Timothy Shea to Andy Badolato 3/12/19. Starting from -- Mr. Shea says sounds like three of the police officers will be rolling in between 4:30 and 5:30 as they get off duty. See e-mail below.

E-mail below. I have three Hamilton county deputies phasing in as they get off duty from 4:30, 5, 5:30 p.m. I also have Cincinnati police that will have two officers here plus a captain that can call in more resources if needed.

And this is the back of the e-mail.

The next e-mail, your Honor, and ladies and gentlemen of the jury, are 623 and 623A. 623 is from Timothy Shea to Brian Kolfage, states: Thanks, Brian.

623A is a Ranch Property Management invoice and the description states: Contract company to utilize commercial drone service to gather footage over the southern border. The

service provided drones using streaming 4K video both during the day and night to gather intelligence on border crossings in Sunland Park, New Mexico. Contractor is licensed to fly in Mexico's airspace as well as the U.S.A. Five consecutive days and fights, \$9,345 per day. Subtotal \$46,725.33.

The next exhibit is 627. This is from Timothy Shea to Brian Kolfage on November 6, 2019.

Hi, Brian. Please look over my proposal, sign, send back to me. Also, will include wire instructions U.S. Bank Ranch Property, the numbers, Castle Rock, Colorado. Thanks, Tim.

This is 627A, and this is a contract and the contract at the end, the filming, you guys can read it the total of the contract is \$57,756.

All right. The next e-mail is 628 and 628A. And it is an e-mail, again, from Timothy Shea to Brian Kolfage on December 13, 2019, at 10:42 a.m.

Hi, Brian. Here's the invoice, U.S. Bank Ranch
Property Marketing and Management. Castle, Colorado. RPMM.
And the invoice and it's 628A, and ladies and gentlemen, you can look at it. just the total is \$20,856.

602. 602 is 602 and 602A. It is an e-mail from Timothy Shea to Amanda Shea on January 22, 2020. And the invoice is attached at 602A, and the invoice is for marketing towards the new building locations in Mission, Texas, and Rio

Grande Valley, Texas. Utilize Facebook ads, utilize Google ads, pull info on local landowners' tract locations and cold calls. Set up meeting. Total \$5,817.

Next exhibit is Defense Exhibit 800. And this exhibit, Exhibit 800, is July 16, 2019, from Timothy Shea to Brian Kolfage. And there is an attachment 800A. And here's the invoice. Yikes. That's what Mr. Shea says.

And attached to the e-mail is 800A, it is an invoice from Sky Front, creation date of the invoice is July 15, 2019. It is prepared by a person by the name of Troy Metzler and the contact is Timothy Shea. And the invoice is for \$64,500 for premier MRS, medium range surveillance, perimeter surveillance, electronic fuel injection, ground control station laptop and software, laptop stand, two custom fit pelican transport cases, battery charges, medium range telemetry and video. And then the camera, the rental for the camera is 15,000 and tax is 5 percent. And the total of this invoice is \$84,475.

Okay. I'm done with this batch. We have just a few more. Does anybody know how to work this?

At this time, your Honor, the government and I have agreed that the defense could move a picture of the border wall after completion. Defense Exhibit 302.

THE COURT: It is admitted.

(Defendant's Exhibit 302 received in evidence)

MR. MERINGOLO: I can't get it on the screen so I'll

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

show ladies and gentlemen of the jury. This is Exhibit 302.

This is Exhibit 613. And it is Exhibit 613. And 613A. And it is Timothy Shea on March 29, 2019. Timothy Shea to landowners. Subject landowners to Andy Badolato and Brian Kolfage.

Hi, fellas. Read this over, let me know if any changes need to be made. Thanks, Tim Shea, associate broker, Realty One Premier Group. And the attachment is 613A, and it states:

Dear landowner. We have been contracted by We Build the Wall to identify privately owned property along the United States-Mexico. The nonprofit group backed by some of the biggest names in politics is excited to be currently working with private landowners to build a barrier along the national border wall. Additionally, We Build the Wall is protecting individuals' property along the border wall at no cost to the landowner. In some areas where the wall has already been built, we have seen a dramatic increase in land due to the protection of property. More importantly than the increase in value is the owners have a new, needed sense of safety and security. This is an exciting opportunity to be a part of history in the making led by the first, and only, privately funded effort to secure our nation's border. We Build the Inc. Is fulfilling a decades old political promise made Wall. to the American people and have been given Donald Trump's

blessing. It would be our pleasure and honor to set up a phone call or meeting with you and one of the We Build the Wall board members, including the cause's founder, triple amputee war hero Brian Kolfage to discuss the plans for building the wall and how your property can be a very valuable part of that process. We are also happy to answer any questions you may have about this at this time. We have provided the website information below so you can explore the group's cause, missions plans and progress. Please feel free to contact us by phone to speak to us personally.

Direct line. Ranch Property Management and Marketing 1-800-608 -- everybody knows the website. That's 613A.

763 -- we only have one more after this -- is an e-mail from Jason Miller to Tim Shea. This is an e-mail from Jason Miller, subject border wall, to Tim Shea.

Hi Andy, here is the contract for the security detail.

I'll call you in the morning.

Hi Tim, great talking with you tonight. Thanks for clearing up a few things for me. I've attached the LOA. As discussed, though, this is just a draft version. As you'll see there are some blank spaces, namely if we move forward, I'll need the physical address or the closest cross streets of the site, billing addresses, your title, credit card or wire transfer instructions for advance payment, and the local POC's whom we'll meet with on Wednesday for coordination and

Thursday. When work begins, I will make the final changes and resubmit the document to you or whomever you designate via docusign, which is easy to execute on your phone or any device. Please try to have an answer for me by close of business tomorrow so I have time to get our agents scheduled and get my travel arrangements made. I understand this is a sizable amount of money, but I hope we can make this work. Feel free to call me.

The last exhibit is 764. And it is a proposal to Tim Shea from Jason Miller. Oh this -- this is 764 but that's related to the e-mail I just read to you. This is the proposal that Tim was talking -- this is the border wall that We Build the Wall built.

And your Honor, at this time, defense would like to play a two-minute video.

THE COURT: You may.

MR. MERINGOLO: Thank you, Judge.

(Video playing)

MR. MERINGOLO: Judge, that was very unclear and the sound, I think it will be in evidence, it will be much clearer. If the jury wants to watch it.

THE COURT: Of course.

MR. MERINGOLO: All right.

Judge, the defense rests.

THE COURT: Members of the jury, the defense has

rested and has finished presenting evidence, but that does not mean that the trial is over. We still have summations, both sides, as well as my instructions on the law. That will go forward on next Tuesday. And so we have come to the end of our work for today.

It's very important that you remember that I have not yet told you that it's time to deliberate. We're about to stop, and recess until next Tuesday at 9 a.m. And I want to remind you of the instructions that I gave you earlier about your conduct as jurors.

During this recess, and all other recesses, do not discuss the case with anyone, including your fellow jurors, other people involved in the trial, members of your family, friends or anyone else. Do not speak at all with any of the parties, the witnesses or the attorneys. Do not permit anyone to discuss the case with you. Do not even remain in the presence of anyone discussing the case. If anyone approaches you, and tries to talk to you about the case, please report that to me through my clerk immediately. Do not read, watch, or listen to any news reporting concerning the trial in a newspaper, on the internet, or television. Do not use the internet or library or any other source to look for information about the parties, the witnesses, the lawyers or anything else associated with the case. Do not conduct any kind of investigation on your own.

The only information that you are to consider in deciding the case is what you have learned in this courtroom during the trial.

However, you are not ready yet to decide the case. As we part today for this long weekend, I want to remind you that you are being entrusted with a great responsibility in being able to return home for a number of days. I'm sure that each of you will make every effort to ensure that none of the restrictions is violated.

You must return to the courtroom at 9 a.m. on this coming Tuesday, May 31.

I hope all of you have a lovely holiday weekend. Thank you.

(Jury excused)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

I did not receive any further comments with respect to the instructions.

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. We are in the process of drafting a letter that we hope to file today. There are not any alterations to the instructions as your Honor drafted them. It might be just two or three very discrete additions related to events from the trial, but it is still something we are working on and we hope to have that filed today.

THE COURT: Very well.

MR. SOBELMAN: Just one other minor issue to raise. I

want to clarify for the record that the defense e-mails that were offered were not offered for their truth. There is no hearsay exception that would apply. To the extent they contain any factual assertions, we would ask that the Court instruct the defense they cannot argue the truth of the matters asserted in those e-mails.

THE COURT: So, for what purpose, Mr. Meringolo, were they admitted?

MR. MERINGOLO: They were admitted to refute the government saying there were no legitimate invoices.

THE COURT: Is that the government's understanding?

MR. SOBELMAN: Not sure precisely the purpose that the defense thought they were relevant. We tried not to object to every single document they wished to offer. But, there were some documents, for example, there was an e-mail that attached an invoice. The invoice itself we have no objection to the fact that it is an invoice. But, to the extent it states that certain work was done, we don't think the defense can rely on the truth that, okay, because there was an invoice, the work was done. They can say there was an invoice, and this is what the invoice asked for. But, we think that extra step would be inappropriate, given the fact there is no hearsay exception.

So I want to clarify that they can reference the documents, there were invoices sent, but they can't then say the invoice is proof that the items listed in the invoice

actually occurred.

MR. MERINGOLO: Well, if I said, your Honor, Timothy
Shea did work, without referencing — I think we have evidence
in there that in fact he did do work. Did he send, he did send
the people a letter that he proposed to go get the property?
They got the property. You know, they had events, there was
security. I mean...

THE COURT: Why didn't the prosecution object to the admission of the documents?

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, because the documents, if not offered for their truth, we think are admissible. We don't think they're highly probative of anything.

other invoices that Timothy Shea sent to Brian Kolfage or to We Build the Wall, at other points, invoicing for other purported work, I think they're entitled — again, I don't find it persuasive — I think they are entitled to say, hey, there were other financial transactions between these individuals that the government didn't put before the jury.

But, the truth of those underlying events occurring, in the same way that the government can't offer an invoice to show that the underlying event actually occurred, absent a hearsay objection.

THE COURT: I think we need to go through these documents, because I want to understand what you've agreed to

and what you haven't agreed to.

MR. SOBELMAN: That's fine. We can go through it. I think whatever your Honor thinks is appropriate. I am not asking for that. I simply wanted to make sure --

THE COURT: He has to understand what it is that he can discuss in summation. My understanding was that you had come to an agreement together with respect to the documents, you did not make an objection. So, it is important that Mr. Meringolo understand what he can say for his summation.

MR. SOBELMAN: That's fine, your Honor. Just to be clear, Ms. Moe said in opening that the government concedes Mr. Shea did work for We Build the Wall. So there is no, as far as we see it, that's not the battleground in this case. We are not going to say in closing or rebuttal that Mr. Shea did no work for We Build the Wall.

So we see this as a little bit of a side issue. To the extent the defense wants to rely on the truth of some of the statements in these documents, I think we should talk about whether that's appropriate. We didn't understand him to be offering it for that purpose.

THE COURT: So, my impression was that the defense was offering the documents as evidence of work that was accomplished. I don't know of any other reason they would have offered the documents.

MR. SOBELMAN: We understand that to be the purpose of

the documents your Honor precluded. We didn't have a conversation with them specifically about the purpose for which they were offering the ones to which we didn't object. Because we understood that they had a potential non-hearsay purpose.

THE COURT: Well, then let's specify what the non-hearsay purpose is.

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor. I am not sure if you want to go document by document.

THE COURT: Yes, that's what we'll do. Document by document.

MR. SOBELMAN: Okay.

MR. MERINGOLO: Judge, they had their, they didn't object to it. Now it's in evidence. And I mean, now I can't argue what's in evidence? I can't argue that here is an exhibit, here is the invoice, you decide, ladies and gentlemen what that means. What I say is not evidence. You decide what that e-mail means, you decide what the attachment means. I don't understand.

MR. SOBELMAN: We have no objection to that. What I am saying is he can't put up an invoice --

MR. MERINGOLO: I'll do it a different way.

MR. SOBELMAN: The point is you can't put up an invoice and say Tim Shea billed for X, Y, Z, and, therefore, that happened, without other evidence saying that happened. Which there is no evidence in the record that it did.

(Continued on next page)

M5Q3SHE1

THE COURT: I think there is more that he is going to argue. I think he'll probably argue that he billed for X, and that shows that he was undertaking the construction of the wall.

MR. SOBELMAN: I'm not sure what he's going to argue.

But my point is the invoice is evidence that the invoice was sent; that Tim Shea, for example, sent a bill to We Build the Wall or Brian Kolfage that contained whatever it contained. But we don't think it's proper for him to then say, Because the invoice said that, it must have happened, because this invoice has to be true.

THE COURT: So the question is, is he offering it to show that these emails reflect Mr. Shea's work on the project or is he offering it to show that the project was underway or it was completed? I think we need to define that.

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, I think Mr. Meringolo can argue inferences from the facts that are admissible. But to rely on the truth of a document to which there's no hearsay exception we think is improper. The nonhearsay purpose of explaining there were other invoices sent, this is what the invoices said. But to then say, you know, because this document says this work was performed means this work was performed, it's that last step that we think is improper as to a couple of the emails.

THE COURT: So you have no problem with his stating that there was an invoice for X service or X goods, but you have a problem with him saying that that means that those services or goods were provided?

MR. SOBELMAN: Let me confer with counsel for one

second just to make sure I'm being clear.

(Counsel conferred)

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, we think it's totally proper for defense counsel to say the fact that there's an invoice is circumstantial evidence that the work occurred. But it's a subtle distinction. But I just want to make sure our position is at least clear, and if we get guidance from the Court on this, because we don't want to be objecting in closing if it's something your Honor would not be troubled by.

But we do think there is a line that could be crossed between saying, Here's an invoice, you know, this is what was — this is what was said from person A to person B; and you should infer from that that this work happened, rather than, It says here the work happened and, therefore, the work happened. I think that's the subtle distinction. It's a direct versus circumstantial point. And I think that's sort of the hearsay line to draw.

MR. MERINGOLO: Judge, there's nothing in the stipulation preserving a hearsay objection. You know what's really crazy? That work was all done. That's what's really crazy here. I know it has nothing to do with what's going on in this case, but all that work was done; all those invoices were paid.

Now we're like, Oh, Meringolo is going to do this.

You know what? Meringolo doesn't know what he's going to do

until he does it. I mean, it is -- it may be objectionable, it doesn't come out correctly, I don't read right. It is what it is. Everything is all in the air.

But for me to sit here and say I can't argue this email was sent on this day, Tim was working, I mean, the email itself is work. If he's talking to a contractor, getting — somebody's giving him a proposal and he's sending an invoice, that's work. You know, I mean, maybe it's not like digging a ditch or anything else, but it's still work.

MR. SOBELMAN: I don't think we disagree with any of that. He can certainly argue these emails were sent, he sent these invoices. It might be that there's no disagreement here at the end of the day. I just wanted to flag the issue because as we were going through them with the jury, there were a few statements that we thought might be interpreted the wrong way.

We can move on.

THE COURT: I don't want to have surprising objections; I want to resolve this now so that he can prepare his summation.

 $$\operatorname{MR}.$$  SOBELMAN: If you want, your Honor, we can try talking it out.

THE COURT: Would you please do that?

We'll take a brief recess.

(Recess)

THE COURT: Please be seated.

MR. SOBELMAN: Your Honor, we consulted with the defense. I think we have a mutual understanding of, sort of, where the line is. If there's an issue, we'll object; but I don't expect there will be.

THE COURT: Would you please let me know what the line is.

MR. SOBELMAN: Yes, your Honor.

I think the line is between arguing the truth of individual factual assertions in the emails or invoices versus the fact that emails — that the invoices and emails were sent, are certainly evidence that Tim Shea was doing — was sending the invoices, that was contacting those people, was involved in those activities. And it's circumstantial evidence that the underlying activities occurred.

THE COURT: It's circumstantial evidence that what was discussed in the emails was consummated?

MR. SOBELMAN: I think that would be a fair inference for the defense to ask the jury to make, is that if someone is discussing a potential business deal, you could say, Well, they discussed it, and you can infer from that that maybe it happened. I think it's speculative and probably a weak inference, but we're trying to be — take a wide view of permissible inferences that the defense could ask the jury to draw.

THE COURT: Very well.

24

25

1	Anything further?
2	MR. MERINGOLO: No, Judge.
3	THE COURT: All right. Then I look forward to getting
4	your comments on the instructions. Mr. Meringolo, if you have
5	comments, I would also like them to be in today.
6	MR. MERINGOLO: Judge, we were just discussing we may
7	want an idle we'll send to you an idle chatter possibly
8	an idle chatter instruction standard, because of all the text
9	messages had a lot of idle chatter in it, certain responses on
10	some of the emails that are in evidence. You can rule however,
11	you know, but I just think there was just a lot of idle chatter
12	going back and forth.
13	THE COURT: I just want to resolve this so that at 9
14	a.m. on Tuesday, we can just dive right into summations.
15	MR. MERINGOLO: We'll be ready.
16	MR. ROOS: I'm sorry, I don't know what the idle
17	chatter instruction
18	MR. MERINGOLO: We'll ask we'll send the Court an
19	idle chatter instruction. You can object.
20	MR. ROOS: I don't even know what it is, so I'm not
21	sure
22	THE COURT: Mr. Roos is asking what is the substance
23	of an idle chatter instruction.

messages going back and forth. And some of those text messages

MR. MERINGOLO: The substance is that there were text

are just idle chatter, what it says. We'll get the Court the instruction this afternoon. Not in furtherance of the conspiracy. Like if they were talking about — in these long emails, there were parts of the emails that they weren't talking about We Build the Wall. Talking about, You're going to go to dinner, Tim, which isn't We Build the Wall. That's idle chatter. It's not in furtherance.

THE COURT: But what is the instruction that I am to direct them to disregard idle chatter? What is the instruction?

MR. MERINGOLO: I'll send it to you, like the government is going to send it to you later, their proposals.

THE COURT: All right.

MR. ROOS: Sounds to me like he's just asking your

Honor to characterize certain evidence as idle chatter and

disregard it, which doesn't seem right to me. But we'll put in

an opposition to whatever they put in.

THE COURT: I have never seen that instruction, and I've been doing this for a long time.

MR. MERINGOLO: Maybe we did something that you didn't see. Listen, Judge, some judges put it in, some judges take it out. That's just what we thought of off the top of our head today. If you rule against us, we don't really take -- we accept it and sit down. We don't come back and cry, you know?

THE COURT: Good. All righty, then.

	M5QVSHE2
1	So I wish everyone good health and a wonderful holiday
2	weekend.
3	MR. MERINGOLO: Thank you, Judge.
4	(Adjourned to May 31, 2022, at 9 o'clock a.m.)
5	
6	GOVERNMENT EXHIBITS
7	Exhibit No. Received
8	S1, S3, S5, S6
9	452
10	S2, 271
11	S9
12	S10
13	S12
14	S11
15	DEFENDANT EXHIBITS
16	Exhibit No. Received
17	602, 613, 627, 628, 728, 740, 763, 764, 800 & <b>5hé</b> ir subparts
18	302
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	